

REMARKS

I. Claim 1

In the Final Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 as allegedly being anticipated by Moerder et al. Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. Amended claim 1 defines a modular wide-range microwave communications unit that includes, *inter alia*:

at least one precalibrated RF module having RF circuitry and an RF module memory operative for storing calibration values for the RF circuitry, the RF circuitry including RF transmit circuitry and wherein the RF module memory includes an RF transmit module memory, the RF transmit circuitry including an attenuator, an IF detector and an RF detector, and with said RF module memory storing transmit calibration values for the attenuator and the IF and RF detectors

In the Office action it is alleged that Moerder et al. teach an IF detector and an RF detector 84 of Fig. 5. See page 4 of the Final office action. However, Moerder et al. make clear that detector 84 detects RF power level, as opposed to IF power. See col. 6, lines 61-66. It is clear that Moerder et al. do not contemplate detecting IF power level in the outdoor (transmitting) unit, because the IF signal is upconverted to an RF signal at multiplexer 80, which is before any detection occurs by detector 84. See schematic of Fig. 5 and accompanying text. As a result, Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Moerder et al.

II. Claim 32

Claim 32 was rejected over Walker et al in view of Moerder et al. Specifically, it was alleged that in the text bridging col. 7, lines 11-21 Walker et al. teach:

an IF/radio processing card (IF/RPC) module including precalibrated IF transmit circuitry, precalibrated IF receive circuitry, a telemetry circuit, a memory for holding calibration values associated with the IF transmit and receive circuitries, a processor adapted to control respective configuration and operations of the IF receive and transmit circuitries based on their associated calibration values and based on control signaling received via the telemetry circuit . . .

Applicants traverse this allegation, because column 7, lines 11-21 are directed to the receive array of Walker et al.'s invention and as such there is no teaching of IF receive circuitries.

Rather, as discussed in Walker et al., the receive array receives RF signals and converts the same to IF signals. See col. 4, lines 15-19. Therefore, there is no need, or teaching, of having an IF receive circuitry in the receive array as alleged in the Office action. Based upon the foregoing Applicants contend that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present.

III. New Claim 42

It is submitted that the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply with equal weight to claim 42 due to claim 42 defining a modular wide-range microwave communications that includes, *inter alia*, a precalibrated RF module having RF transmit module with RF circuitry including RF transmit circuitry and a module memory including an RF transmit module memory operative for storing calibration values for the RF transmit circuitry, the RF transmit circuitry including a transmit attenuator, an IF detector and an RF detector. Therefore it is submitted that

claim 42 defines an invention suitable for patent protection under the laws of the United States of America.

IV. Dependent Claims

Considering that the dependent claims include the features of the independent claims from which they depend, the dependent claims are patentable to the extent that the independent claims are patentable. It is submitted, therefore, that a prima facie case of obvious is not present with respect to the remaining dependent claims for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

V. Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that the claims be examined and in view of the amendments and remarks made above. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-2811.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kenneth C. Brooks/

Date: January 15, 2008

KENNETH C. BROOKS, Reg. No. 38,393
Attorney for Applicants
CUSTOMER No. 58773
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 210
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel. 650.320-7673